

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 LAS VEGAS REGIONAL SURGERY
11 CENTER, L.P.,

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 BLUE CROSS OF COLORADO,

15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00093-RFB-NJK

Order

(Docket No. 20)

16 Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order
17 requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 20. The joint proposed discovery plan suffers
18 from numerous deficiencies.

19 The parties seek an extended discovery period of 223 days measured from July 5, 2018,
20 the date they filed the instant joint proposed discovery plan, as opposed to February 2, 2018, the
21 date the first Defendant answered or appeared. *Id.* at 1; *see also* Docket No. 12. Local Rule 26-
22 1(b)(1) requires that the discovery cut-off be measured from the date the first Defendant appeared,
23 not the date the parties filed their untimely joint proposed discovery plan. *See* Docket No. 19 (the
24 Court's order to file a joint proposed discovery plan).

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Moreover, a discovery period longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period
2 of 180 days “must include...a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should
3 apply....” Local Rule 26-1(a). The parties fail to abide by this requirement.¹ See Docket No. 20.

4 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties’ joint proposed discovery
5 plan. Docket No. 20. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than
6 July 13, 2018.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: July 6, 2018

9
10 
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 ¹ The Court acknowledges Defendant’s statement that it “does not object to Plaintiff’s
25 proposed discovery timeline at this time, except to state that: (1) depending upon the outcome on
26 Anthem’s pending motion to dismiss ... [Defendant] may seek an extension to the proposed
27 discovery plan.” Docket No. 20 at 2. As a preliminary matter, the instant filing is not “Plaintiff’s
28 proposed discovery timeline,” but the parties’ stipulated discovery plan. *Id.* Additionally, the
Court emphasizes to the parties that self-imposed discovery stays are prohibited. See e.g.
Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc., 278 F.R.D. 597 (D. Nev. Dec. 13, 2011); see also Fed.R.Civ.P. 29(b)
(stipulations that interfere with completing discovery require Court approval); Local Rule 26-
1(b)(1).